

February 17, 2010

Reply to the Office Action dated November 20, 2009

Page 5 of 8

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 16-25 are pending in this application.

Non-elected Claims 23-25 are dependent upon generic Claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow Claims 23-25 when generic Claim 16 is allowed.

Claims 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakamoto et al. (U.S. 6,228,196). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 16-22.

Claim 16 recites:

A method for manufacturing a chip electronic component-mounted ceramic substrate, comprising the steps of:

mounting a chip electronic component including a ceramic sintered compact defining an element assembly and terminal electrodes on a ceramic green body having conductors thereon such that the terminal electrodes are brought into contact with the corresponding conductors; and

firing the ceramic green body having the chip electronic component so as to integrate the conductors on the ceramic green body with the corresponding terminal electrodes of the chip electronic component by sintering. (emphasis added)

In the Response to Arguments section on pages 2 and 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner stated:

Applicants assert that the prior art Sakamoto et al. do not teach the limitation of "mounting a chip electronic component including a ceramic sintered compact defining . . ." (Remarks, pages 8 and 9; Claim 16, line 3). In response, the claims are viewed in light of the specification and the claimed limitation "mounting a chip electronic component including a ceramic sintered compact defining . . ." is construed as "mounting a chip electronic component including a whole ceramic sintered compact group (Fig. 1, 1) defining . . ." where the prior art Sakamoto et al. at a minimum teach the claimed limitation. Furthermore, with respect to the applicants' remarks on page 8 about the claimed limitation of mounting a chip electronic component without any bonding material not taught by the prior art Sakamoto et al., in response to these remarks, the examiner needs to emphasize that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims,

February 17, 2010

Reply to the Office Action dated November 20, 2009

Page 6 of 8

which are judged with their broadest reasonable interpretation. Moreover, it appears that applicants fail to recognize the scope of the claims when judged in view of the prior art Sakamoto et al. (See MPEP 2111 and In re Geuns, 26 USPQ 2nd 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

Applicant respectfully and strenuously disagrees.

Each of the Examiner's allegations in the Response to Arguments is completely irrelevant to the features recited in Applicant's Claim 16 and to Applicant's arguments presented in the Amendment filed on July 31, 2009. Regardless of the Examiner's interpretation of the features recited in Applicant's Claim 16, Applicant's Claim 16 requires that a ceramic **sintered** compact be mounted on a ceramic **green** body, and that the ceramic **green** body having the ceramic **sintered** compact mounted thereon be **fired together**. As is extremely well-known in the art, a "green" ceramic is, by definition, a ceramic material before sintering. That is a "green" ceramic material is, by definition, an **unsintered** ceramic material.

In contrast to Applicant's Claim 16, as described in the Amendment filed on July 31, 2009, col. 12, lines 49-65 and col. 14, lines 51-54 of Sakamoto et al. disclose:

A compact block for a capacitor containing **a raw ceramic functional material 10g to be the above-mentioned capacitor 10 and a compact block for an inductor containing a raw ceramic functional material 11g to be the inductor 11** are prepared, respectively.

The compact block for a capacitor 10g includes a ceramic dielectric member as the ceramic functional material so as to provide a laminated structure where multi-layer internal conductors 21 **are formed via a raw dielectric sheet 20 containing the ceramic dielectric member**. Terminal electrodes 22 and 23 are formed at end faces of the compact block 10 facing to each other. The internal electrodes 21 are provided such that ones to be connected with the terminal electrode 22 at one side and ones to be connected with the terminal electrode 23 at the other side are arranged alternately as in an internal electrode in a known laminated ceramic capacitor.

...

With the compact blocks 10g and 11g, and the ceramic green sheets 2g to 8g accordingly obtained, a raw composite compact 1g to be the multi-layer ceramic substrate 1 after baking can be produced as follows. (emphasis added)

February 17, 2010

Reply to the Office Action dated November 20, 2009

Page 7 of 8

That is, none of the chip electronic components 10-12 of Sakamoto et al. include a ceramic sintered compact when they are mounted on/in the ceramic green unsintered body 1g. Instead, each of the electronic components 10-12 of Sakamoto et al. include ceramic green unsintered sheets when they are mounted on/in the ceramic green unsintered body 1g. Then, after the entire ceramic green unsintered body 1g, including the electronic components 10-12 comprised of ceramic green sheets, is assembled, the entire ceramic green unsintered body 1g is fired to form the sintered multilayer ceramic component.

Thus, Sakamoto et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the features and steps of “mounting a chip electronic component including a ceramic sintered compact defining an element assembly and terminal electrodes on a ceramic green body having conductors thereon such that the terminal electrodes are brought into contact with the corresponding conductors” and “firing the ceramic green body having the chip electronic component so as to integrate the conductors on the ceramic green body with the corresponding terminal electrodes of the chip electronic component by sintering” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 16.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakamoto et al.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the method of Sakamoto et al. to include the step of “mounting a chip electronic component including a ceramic sintered compact defining an element assembly and terminal electrodes on a ceramic green body having conductors thereon such that the terminal electrodes are brought into contact with the corresponding conductors” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 16, because Sakamoto et al. fails to teach or suggest anything at all about any ceramic sintered compact which could or should be mounted on a ceramic green body prior to baking or firing, or that there would have been any reason, incentive, or motivation to do so.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 16 is allowable. Claims 17-22 depend upon Claim 16, and are therefore

Application No. 10/596,312
February 17, 2010
Reply to the Office Action dated November 20, 2009
Page 8 of 8

allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 16 is allowable. In addition, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow non-elected Claims 23-25 along with generic Claim 16.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 17, 2010

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200
Reston, VA 20191
Telephone: (571) 313-7440
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710